

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 4-6, and 8-11 are pending, Claims 1, 4, 6, 8 and 9 having been amended, Claims 10 and 11 having been added, and Claims 2-3 and 7 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action Claims 1-3 and 6-9 were rejected as being anticipated by Nohara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,428,832, hereinafter Nohara) and Claims 4 and 5 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the identification of allowable subject matter. In reply, Claim 4 has been rewritten in independent form and therefore Claim 4, as well as Claims 5 and 6 which depend therefrom, are believed to be in allowable form.

Amended Claim 1 describes a wireless communication apparatus that detects a state of multipath, and sends multipath detection information to another wireless communication apparatus via a wireless network. The another wireless communication apparatus generates a signal inverted from an interference wave signal generated by using the multipath detection information. The another wireless communication apparatus sends the inverted signal and a send signal to the wireless communication apparatus, which in turn receives the inverted signal and the send signal so that interference is canceled by the inverted signal.

In contrast to amended Claim 1, Nohara is directed to a noise suppression apparatus that includes a tuner 1 that receives a radio wave signal, a field information detecting means 2, which detects electric field information about a radio wave signal, and a noise generating means 6 which generates a noise pattern (in combination with a noise pattern memory 6a). A noise canceller 4 removes a noise component from the signal output from the tuner 1 by way

of the noise pattern generated by the noise data generator 6. In particular, a subtractor means 4d subtracts the noise pattern from the signal received by way of the tuner 1.

Comparing amended Claim 1 to Nohara, amended Claim 1 requires a send part which sends multipath detection information to another wireless communication apparatus. This feature is absent in Nohara. Claim 1 further requires that another wireless communication apparatus generate a signal inverted from an interference wave signal generated by using the multipath detection information. This feature is absent in Nohara. Claim 1 further requires that the inverted signal and a send signal are sent to the wireless communication apparatus such that the wireless communication apparatus may cancel the interference by the inverted signal. Once again, these features are absent in Nohara.

The outstanding Office Action asserts that (at page 5 thereof) Nohara discloses sending a signal which cancels the multipath component, where the signal is an inverted signal from an interference wave generated from the multipath component. However, Nohara actually discloses merely subtracting noise from the input signal. Nohara neither teaches nor suggests the use of another wireless communication apparatus that generates a signal inverted from an interference wave signal generated by using the multipath detection information and sends the inverted signal to the wireless communication apparatus that sent the multipath detection information via the wireless network. Moreover, by merely having only “local” noise (or interference) signals available to it, Nohara would not be able to make use of the multipath effects created by the communication channel when generating an inverted signal. An advantage of the present invention is that by using another wireless communication apparatus, it is possible to make use of the channel (which corrupts an intended signal by way of multipath) to help develop a signal that can be used to suppress multipath. Nohara neither teaches nor suggests this attribute. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 patentably defines over Nohara. For substantially similar reasons it is respectfully

submitted that independent Claims 8 and 9, as well as new Claims 10 and 11 also patentably define over Nohara.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1, 4-6, and 8-11, as amended, patentably defines over the asserted prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 08/03)

BDL\la

I:\ATTY\BDL\208970US\208970US-AM.DOC

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Registration No. 40,073